REMARKS

INTRODUCTION:

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 12, 16, 34, 36, 38, 39 and 40 have been amended, and new claim 41 has been added. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4-13, 15-22, 34, 36 and 38-41 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

CLAIM OBJECTION:

Claim 16 was objected to for an informality. Claim 16 has been amended to depend from claim 12. Thus, claim 16 is now submitted to be in acceptable form.

CHANGES TO THE SPECIFICATION:

The specification has been reviewed in response to this Office Action. Changes have been made to the specification only to place it in preferred and better U.S. form for issuance and to resolve the Examiner's objections raised in the Office Action. The term "pants" in line 27 of page 4 was inadvertently not capitalized. This error has been corrected. No new matter has been added.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112:

In the Office Action, at pages 2-3, numbered paragraphs 3-6, claims 1-2, 4-13, 15-22, 34, 36 and 38-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for the reasons set forth therein. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

It is respectfully submitted that the independent claims have been amended for clarity. To further clarify the terms "standard descriptor" and "special descriptor," the Examiner is directed to FIG. 1. In FIG. 1, the first row of terms to the right of the GD and Data Structure Business A: HD GD are "standard descriptors." The second and third rows of terms to the right of same are "special descriptors." Thus, for example, if "Identification" (row 2, a special descriptor) is known only by the database, the query side may ask for "Color" or "Name" (which are associated with "Identification") or may use reference logic to map to "Identification." Note that the mapping is 2:1. Similarly, if the term "Date" is desired, but the query structure only

knows the term "Purchase" or "Season," the database may utilize "Date" or may use reference logic to map to "Date." This mapping is also 2:1.

The term "reference logic" has two functions (see page 4 of the specification, lines 17-22):

a) indicating which standard descriptor(s) is used for reference to the special descriptor(s) and vice versa; and

b) giving "logic" for determining a content of the special descriptor by using the content from the standard descriptor and vice versa.

For example, as shown in amended line 17 of page 4, since the term "PANTS" is capitalized, the reference logic determines that the term is the standard descriptor "Name," and is not the standard descriptor "Color."

In order to clarify the terms "special descriptor" and "reference logic", the following terminology has been added to each independent claim (claims 1, 12, 34, 36, 38, 39 and 40):

The amendments to the independent claims 1, 12, 34, 36, 38, 39 and 40 are submitted to render said claims definite. Since claims 2, 4-11, 13, and 15-22 depend from amended claims 1 and 12, respectively, claims 2, 4-11, 13, and 15-22 are submitted to be definite for at least the reasons that amended claims 1 and 12 are submitted to be definite.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

In the Office Action, at pages 3-6, numbered paragraph 8, claims 1-2, 4-13, 15-22, 34, 36 and 38-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al. (USPN 6,397,325; hereafter, Brown). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

It is respectfully submitted that Brown discloses using an alias table for translating one "Program Variable" into one "Database Column Name." In addition, Brown also submits that the variable type can be adjusted. Thus, Brown only describes a one-to-one mapping of "Program Variable" into "Database Column name," and does not disclose a "logic" at all. The term "logic" indicates that a transformation takes place, e.g., in the specification, page 4, lines 17-22, the selling price is determined by a fixed profit margin on the purchase price. This is not disclosed by Brown, because Brown only supports an alias table (see Brown, col. 6, line 49 to col. 7, line 30 for simple one to one mapping, which does not show a logic being utilized, such as a calculation/determination means).

The terminology "generating a query result for a standard descriptor of the query structure that is unknown to the database structure by using the reference logic associated with

the unknown standard descriptor and a special descriptor of the database that is associated with the reference logic, or generating a query result for a special descriptor of the query structure that is unknown to the database structure by using the reference logic associated with the unknown special descriptor and the standard descriptor of the database that is associated with this reference logic," are supported by page 2, line 24 to page 3, line 2 of the specification. The reference logic is used to derive a descriptor and a value from the database even if the descriptor from the query structure is unknown. However, Brown does not disclose the reference logic to evaluate unknown standard/special descriptors by known special/standard descriptors. Brown simply states "to construct a database command" (see Brown, col. 7, lines 23-26) in the case where no corresponding column name for a program variable name can be found. However, Brown fails to disclose that both a reference logic is used for both referencing the descriptor to the associated unknown descriptor AND the content transformation.

It should be noted that the present claimed invention recites a one-to-N and/or N-to-one mapping feature, whereby N can be greater than one. Thus, one standard descriptor may be derived from at least two standard descriptors by the reference logic and/or one standard descriptor maybe derived from at least two special descriptors by the reference logic. As noted above, this mapping feature is shown in FIG. 1, and is supported by the description of FIG. 1 in the specification.

Thus, amended claims 1, 12, 34, 36, 38, 39 and 40 are submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Brown et al. (USPN 6,397,325). Since claims 2, 4-11, 13, and 15-22 depend from amended claims 1 and 12, respectively, claims 2, 4-11, 13, and 15-22 are submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Brown et al. (USPN 6,397,325) for at least the reasons that amended claims 1 and 12 are submitted to be allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Brown et al. (USPN 6,397,325).

NEW CLAIM:

New claim 41 recites that the features of the present invention include a method for querying a database, comprising: placing a query in a query structure, one of the query and the database containing a non-standard search field, the other of the query and the database containing a standard search field, the standard search field having a relationship with the non-standard search field which relationship is defined by a reference logic; transmitting the query to the database; making the reference logic available to the database by at least one of: transmitting the reference logic together with the query; and storing the reference logic in association with the database; and using the reference logic at the database to transform the

query structure into a transformed structure having a search field contained in the database, wherein one non-standard search field is derived from at least two standard search fields using the reference logic and/or one standard search field is derived from at least two non-standard search fields using the reference logic.

Nothing in the prior art teaches or suggests such. It is submitted that this new claim distinguishes over the prior art.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited. At a minimum, this Amendment should be entered at least for purposes of Appeal as it either clarifies and/or narrows the issues for consideration by the Board.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited and possibly concluded by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss any such remaining issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _February 10, 2005_   By: _Darleen J. Stockley_

Darleen J. Stockley
Registration No. 34,257

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501